

## REMARKS

Claims 1-17 and 54-56 were pending as of the Office Action mailed August 29, 2008. Claims 1 and 54 are in independent form. Claims 1 and 54 are being amended. No claims are being cancelled. Claims 57-61 have been newly added. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found within the applicant's specification at least at page 2, lines 9-15, page 6, line 4 through page 7, line 22, and FIG. 3. Support for the new claims can also be found within the applicant's specification at least at page 2, lines 9-15, page 6, line 4 through page 7, line 22, and FIG. 3.

Reconsideration and reexamination of the application is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### **Interview Summary**

The applicant thanks Examiner Darno for the courtesy of the telephonic interview on November 12, 2008. The time spent with the applicant's representative Arrienne M. Lezak was greatly appreciated. During the interview, the applicant's representatives explained that the provisioning request message includes a provisioning reply message. Recommendations were made by the examiner for overcoming the prior art. These recommendation have been incorporated into the claims as noted above.

### **Section 103 Rejections**

Claims 1, 2, 5-13, and 54-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,980,817 ("Chow") in view of U.S. Patent Appl. No. 2003/0065738 ("Yang").

Claims 3, 4, 14, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the combined teachings of Chow and Yang and in further view of U.S. Patent Appl. No. 2004/0087300 ("Lewis").

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the combined teachings of Chow and Yang and in further view of U.S. Patent Appl. No. 2004/0058652 ("McGregor").

### Claim 1

To expedite prosecution, and in accordance with the examiner's recommendations, claim 1 has been amended to recite, "the provisioning request message being an electronic message having a data structure that includes a provisioning reply, wherein the provisioning system uses the provisioning reply to return status information or error information relating to the provisioning request message to the external system, and wherein the data structure further includes information identifying an entity to which the provisioning event pertains, wherein the identifying information includes one or more attributes defined by the external system".

The applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of Chow, Yang, Lewis, and McGregor, alone or in combination, do not teach or disclose the limitations recited in claim 1, as amended. Thus, the applicant further submits that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Claim 54 recites features corresponding to those of claim 1 and stands rejected for the same reasons. Therefore, claim 54 is allowable for the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 2-17, 55, and 56, depend from independent claims 1 and 54 and are allowable for at least the reasons that apply to those independent claims.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is therefore respectfully requested.

### New Claims 57-61

New claims 57 and 59 recite "wherein the status information describes the status of the provisioning system entity after the provisioning request message has been processed," and new claims 58 and 60 recite "wherein the error information describes an error that occurred while the provisioning system performed an action in the provisioning request message". The applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of Chow, Yang, Lewis, and McGregor, alone or in combination, do not teach or disclose the limitations recited in new claims 57-59.

Additionally, new claims 57-60 depend from independent claims 1 and 54 and are allowable for at least the reasons that apply to those independent claims.

New claim 61 recites features corresponding to those of claims 1 and 57-60, and is therefore allowable for the same reasons set forth above with respect to those claims.

### **Conclusion**

The applicant respectfully requests that all pending claims be allowed.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's selecting some particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, the applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the applicant agrees with any positions taken by the examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 50-1432, (555255-012441).

Respectfully submitted,

JONES DAY

Date:

11/26/08

Joseph M. Sauer (Reg. No. 47,919)  
Jones Day  
North Point, 901 Lakeside Avenue  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
(216) 586-7506